
6.0 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

This section describes the consultation and coordination the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and Western Area Power Administration (Western) have had with government agencies and the public during preparation of this Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Information is presented concerning the scoping process, additional public involvement, additional agency consultation, as well as planned future agency and public involvement. A list of agencies, organizations, and individuals to whom copies of the Draft EIS were sent is also included.

6.1 SCOPING PROCESS

Scoping was the first step in the EIS process and is required by Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Part 1501.7). Scoping is a process for determining the range of issues to be addressed in an EIS and for identifying significant issues associated with the alternatives. The objectives of the scoping process were to notify interested persons, agencies, and other groups about the Proposed Action and the alternatives being considered; solicit comments about environmental issues, alternatives to the Proposed Action, and other items of interest; and consider those comments in the preparation of the EIS.

The scoping process began after BLM and Western published a Notice of Intent (NOI) in the Federal Register on April 18, 2000 (Volume 65, Number 75, pages 20811-20812). The NOI (Appendix H) was published to notify the public that BLM and Western were intending to prepare an EIS for the proposed Big Sandy Energy Project and to invite other Federal agencies, Native American tribes, state and local governments, and the general public to participate in the scoping process. The NOI also announced a public scoping meeting held in Wikieup, Arizona, provided Project contacts, and presented supplementary background

information. The scoping period ended on June 2, 2000, but BLM and Western solicited and accepted comments throughout the EIS preparation process.

In addition to publishing the NOI, display ads announcing the scoping meeting were published in the *Kingman Daily Miner* on April 18, 2000 and May 1, 2000. BLM and Western hosted the public scoping meeting on May 3, 2000 in Wikieup. Thirty-eight people attended representing agencies, the Wikieup community and interested parties. Table 6-1 lists the notes recorded on flip charts at the meeting, the actual questions and comments heard, and the responses which were provided by BLM, Western, or Caithness. All of these comments have been reviewed and considered at various stages during the preparation of this Draft EIS. Many are explicitly addressed in pertinent sections of the first five chapters of this document. Note that some aspects of the Proposed Action have changed since the time of the scoping meeting; these changes are reflected in the rest of this document, although the original responses listed in Table 6-1 has not been revised.

In addition to the public scoping meeting, BLM and Western representatives met with the Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR), the chair of the Arizona Power Plant and Transmission Line Siting Committee under the Arizona Corporation Commission, Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD), and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) at the start of the Project. Discussions with other agencies with jurisdiction or interest in the Project also occurred at that time.

BLM and Western received more than 45 comment response sheets and/or letters and numerous requests for inclusion on the Project mailing list. BLM and Western have used the scoping results to define the following major

issues which have been addressed in this Draft EIS:

- Short-term and long-term effects of groundwater use for proposed power plant cooling, including effects on future water supplies in the Wikieup area and stream flows in the Big Sandy River.
- Direct and indirect effects on fish and wildlife resources and habitats, including the endangered southwestern willow flycatcher and wetland and riparian habitats.
- Direct and indirect effects on the community and values of Wikieup from construction activity, air emissions, future land use changes, landscape changes, noise, and taxation changes.
- Direct and indirect effects on water quality and use in the Project area, including any effects from the proposed pipeline construction.
- Effects on cultural resources and traditional cultural values and uses of Native Americans.
- Effects on existing land uses from the pipeline construction.

Suggestions for alternative power plant facility locations and cooling methods also were received during the scoping period. BLM and Western, with assistance from URS Corporation technical experts, evaluated the feasibility of these alternatives to determine if they warranted full analysis in the EIS (refer to Section 2.4).

As part of the scoping process, BLM and Western consulted with state and local agencies and tribes to the fullest extent possible to reduce duplication between NEPA and comparable state, local, and tribal requirements and ensure consistent decision making. AGFD, ADWR, Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), Mohave County, USFWS, and Hualapai Tribe agreed to participate as cooperating agencies in the preparation of this Draft EIS. (See Section 1.3.3 for more information on cooperating

agency involvement.) The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) also were invited to be cooperating agencies but declined.

6.2 ADDITIONAL PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

In addition to scoping, Western and BLM have conducted public workshops and prepared and distributed newsletters which are described below. Western has the lead responsibility for administering all aspects of public involvement for this EIS process. Western's web site for the Project can be accessed at:

www.wapa.gov/interconn/intsandy.htm

This website contains the following documents specific to this EIS process, and will be updated as the EIS process progresses:

- NOI
- Newsletters
- Map of proposed Project area
- Scoping meeting results
- Project timeline
- Questions and comments
- Record of public workshop held in Wikieup on August 29, 2000
- Record of public workshop held in Peach Springs on August 30, 2000 hosted by the Hualapai Tribe

**TABLE 6-1
COMMENTS RECEIVED AT SCOPING MEETING**

Verbatim Flipchart Notes from Scoping Meeting	Actual Question/Comment Heard at Scoping Meeting	Response Provided at Scoping Meeting and/or Answers to Questions
Quest. for Caithness	N/A	N/A
Normal water req. for each phase?	How much water would be required for each phase?	The estimated average water demand for both phases is 3200-acre feet per year. The EIS will address water consumption impacts.
Why is water from Baghdad not feasible?	Cyprus-Bagdad has offered water for the plant site. What is happening with that?	Cyprus-Bagdad has offered to Caithness to study what options would be available and feasible for using water pumped from the Big Sandy floodplain for the Cyprus-Bagdad mine. The Cyprus-Bagdad pipeline parallels the transmission line corridor near the proposed plant site. The EIS will address the Cyprus-Bagdad water supply options.
Why Gas source from North now? (Orig. from West)	Why has the proposed natural gas (NG) source changed from the El Paso Natural Gas Company transmission line to the west to the NG supply lines to the north. Initially, the route to the west was described as better because of the existing NG supply line right-of-way.	Caithness changed the proposed route to the north because of the McCracken Mountains Area of Critical Environmental Concern and associated desert tortoise habitat and opportunities to utilize the U.S. Highway 93 right-of-way. Upon completion of the scoping process and preliminary environmental inventory, Western and BLM will determine NG pipeline routing alternatives that will be addressed in the EIS.
Still considering a tap for Wikieup?	Will there be a tap of the proposed NG pipeline to supply NG to Wikieup?	Providing NG to the Wikieup area is not part of the Proposed Action. However, Caithness' proposal will do nothing to preclude a NG supply company from providing service to the Wikieup area.
What are the ton per yr of pollution?	How many tons of air pollutants will be emitted from the 720 MW power plant? Caithness has this information and should share it at the scoping meeting.	The EIS will discuss the impacts on air resources, including the amount of air pollutants emitted by the proposed power plant. Western and BLM will independently evaluate and verify the air modeling results in consultation with the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality. Preliminary studies indicate that the maximum yearly potential emissions from the generating facility will be about 213.4 tons of oxides of nitrogen (NO _x), 254 tons of carbon monoxide, 45.2 tons of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), 33.9 tons of sulfur dioxide, 72.4 tons (from NG combustion) and 34.7 tons (from the cooling towers) of PM-10, and a total of 17.45 tons hazardous air pollutants.

**TABLE 6-1
COMMENTS RECEIVED AT SCOPING MEETING**

Verbatim Flipchart Notes from Scoping Meeting	Actual Question/Comment Heard at Scoping Meeting	Response Provided at Scoping Meeting and/or Answers to Questions
My land is being crossed pipeline No more lines on my land	Concerns were expressed about the proposed NG pipeline crossing private land. A ranch owner does not want any more pipelines across his ranch. There would be problems burying the pipeline with Hackberry Road.	Western and BLM will explore routing alternatives to minimize impacts on private lands. The routing alternatives will be addressed in the EIS.
Light pollution looked at, pointed down possibly	What about light pollution? Will the power plant's light cause pollution? Can the lights be designed to minimize light pollution?	Caithness will need to comply with the Mohave County Dark Sky Ordinance, which includes requirements for shielding and filtering. The EIS will address the effects of power plant lighting and possible mitigation measures.
Where is the power going? Anything to County	Will the County get any of the power produced by the power plant or will it all be shipped out?	The proposed Project would be a merchant plant, selling power on the open market. Citizen's Utilities and Mohave Power Cooperative serve Mohave County. Citizen's and Mohave Power Cooperative could pursue purchasing power from the Big Sandy Energy Project or numerous other power suppliers in a deregulated utility environment.
Set parameters must be met? Guidebk ARE THERE Provide website	Are there set parameters that must be studied? Where is this information available?	The EIS will meet the requirements of the CEQ Regulations for Implementing NEPA (40CFR 1500-1508), the DOE NEPA Implementing Procedures (10 CFR 1021, as amended), the Department of the Interior NEPA Implementing Regulations (517DM 1-7), and the BLM NEPA Manual and Handbook (MS 1790, H-1790-1). The CEQ and DOE regulations and related guidelines are available at http://tis.eh.doe.gov/nepa/
Close consultation re: Effects to Res. Trad. & Cultural values & interests TRIBAL CONCERNS Coop Agency?	The Hualapai Tribe wants close consultation with Western and BLM considering concerns about impacts to reservation and cultural and traditional values, for example natural resources and plants. The Hualapai Tribe requested to be a cooperating agency.	Western and BLM invited the Hualapai Tribe to be a cooperating agency, and the Hualapai Tribal Council passed a resolution to become a cooperating agency.

**TABLE 6-1
COMMENTS RECEIVED AT SCOPING MEETING**

Verbatim Flipchart Notes from Scoping Meeting	Actual Question/Comment Heard at Scoping Meeting	Response Provided at Scoping Meeting and/or Answers to Questions
<p>Oppose to the project (TRIBE)</p> <p>No mention on draw down Big Sandy</p> <p>HABITAT Crit. Native Species</p> <p>Natrl Res's</p> <p>Air Quality process</p>	<p>Dr. Kerry Christensen with the Hualapai Tribe is opposed to the Project. Issues with the aquifer drawdown and its effects on the Big Sandy River and associated species habitat, including the southwestern willow flycatcher need to be addressed. What will be the specific drawdown of the Big Sandy? How does the air permitting process work for a two-phase project?</p>	<p>The EIS will address the effects of water pumping on the Big Sandy River and associated wildlife habitats and natural resources. The purpose of the EIS is to analyze the concerns and issues raised during scoping. The drawdown of the aquifer will be addressed in the EIS.</p> <p>The air quality permitting process will address both phases of the Project. If the second phase is not implemented within a time specified by the ADEQ, a new application will need to be submitted for the second phase.</p>
<p>What happens if our wells go dry?</p> <p>50 yrs</p>	<p>What happens if existing wells in the Wikieup area go dry? In 5, 10, or 15 years?</p>	<p>The EIS process involves assessing the impacts to environmental resources, including ground water resources. If impacts are identified, the process is designed to mitigate impacts. The EIS will address the effects of water pumping on existing wells in the Wikieup area. Following the impact assessment, a determination of appropriate monitoring and potential mitigation will be developed and presented in the EIS.</p>
<p>Criteria for water draw down?</p>	<p>How do you test a well for drawdown? How do you test a well for using water for a 10 to 50 year period?</p>	<p>Western and BLM will rely on hydrologists to define tests for determining drawdown. Western and BLM will independently evaluate and verify any tests conducted by Caithness addressing water drawdown effects. A pump test protocol has been developed and reviewed by several hydrologists. The protocol includes pumping water from a production well and observing effects in nearby observation wells. The test will be implemented in late August or early September. The results will be used, together with a basin-wide water budget, to help assess long term impacts.</p>
<p>What happens to water being used?</p>	<p>What happens to the water that is used for the power plant?</p>	<p>Ninety to 95% of the water used for cooling evaporates. About 5% of the water will be discharged to evaporation ponds or used for beneficial agricultural purposes. A detailed water balance for the Project is being developed.</p>

**TABLE 6-1
COMMENTS RECEIVED AT SCOPING MEETING**

Verbatim Flipchart Notes from Scoping Meeting	Actual Question/Comment Heard at Scoping Meeting	Response Provided at Scoping Meeting and/or Answers to Questions
Scenic Highway what hap to it?	What will happen to the scenic highway designation on US Highway 93?	ADOT is a cooperating agency and the impacts on designation will be discussed with ADOT. No effect on the scenic highway designation is expected. The EIS will address the visual resource impacts of the Project, including views from US Highway 93.
Water is a crit resource, bring MC into crit res. comm. for proper water use	Referencing a recent Arizona Republic article, a Hualapai tribal representative suggested bringing Mohave County into the State's groundwater critical resource committee. What are the existing ground water management goals?	Mohave County is a cooperating agency on the EIS. However, BLM and Western cannot influence what the county will do regarding participation in state committees.
Endangered species in Wikieup? (US)	What about the threatened and endangered species that live in Wikieup -- the humans? What about the impacts of lack of water on the people in Wikieup?	The EIS will address impacts to the community of Wikieup, including air, water, social and economic impacts.
BigSandy as Wild/Scenic River Will this effect its status?	Will the proposed Big Sandy Energy Project effect the status of the Big Sandy River as a wild and scenic river?	The portion of the Big Sandy River north of the U.S. Highway 93 bridge does not have the potential to be designated. A portion from the bridge downstream has potential for designation. The EIS will address impacts to the Wild and Scenic River designation. The hydrology studies will determine potential impacts, and all will be disclosed in the EIS.
How is Western paid for this? No compensation? What is the trans. tariff rate	Will Western make a profit from the Big Sandy Project? Who will pay Western's salaries? Does Western receive compensation for granting the interconnection? What is the transmission tariff rate?	Western, as a Federal agency, does not make a profit. Western, in considering applications for interconnection or transmission service, must ensure that its costs for studying the interconnection are not borne by its customers or the public. Therefore, all of Western's costs in addressing the applications are borne by the applicant. The EIS will address Western's policies on open transmission access and include information on the transmission tariff. The transmission tariff rate for firm point-to-point transmission service on the Intertie 500-kV transmission system is currently \$17.23/kW-year.
HB2324 Net Tax Revenue to MC?	What is the net tax revenue that Mohave County will receive?	The EIS will address the socioeconomic impacts to Mohave County, including taxation.

**TABLE 6-1
COMMENTS RECEIVED AT SCOPING MEETING**

Verbatim Flipchart Notes from Scoping Meeting	Actual Question/Comment Heard at Scoping Meeting	Response Provided at Scoping Meeting and/or Answers to Questions
Potential for this p. to prov. benefits?	What are the potential benefits that this Project could provide?	The EIS will address the socioeconomic impacts to Mohave County, including taxation.
How much really comes to Wikieup for comm. imprvmt?	The County has not addressed how \$4.5 million in tax revenue will be addressed. How much will come to Wikieup from County taxes? Will all go to the County seat or will some go to Wikieup?	The EIS will address the socioeconomic impacts to Mohave County and to Wikieup, including taxation.
Will neg. comm. from the commun. be effective in this process? Will they be considered	There was local opposition to the rezoning, but the Board of Supervisors voted for it. How effective will local voices be?	All comments will be addressed during the EIS process. The decision makers will consider all comments received. Local comments have been useful in helping BLM and Western define issues for the EIS.
Will the local comm. comments have more weight? For example, Case Grande	Will the local community have greater weight than other comments? Will information be provided on what happened with the Cassia Grande power plant?	All comments will be considered equally. BLM and Western will collect information on the Casa Grande power plant and determine if it relates to the proposed Project.
Where are the decision makers in the process. Who makes the decision????Mike Hacksaylo Administrator	Why are not the decision makers at the scoping meeting? Why aren't people at the scoping meeting who can answer questions.	The decision makers are Mike Hacksaylo, Western's Administrator and John Christensen, BLM Kingman Field Office Manager. The EIS process is intended to disclose the positive and negative impacts for the decision makers review.
Concern that the process doesn't happen in conjunction w/answers Decisions w/held until after voting	There is a concern that the decisions have already been made and public input will not be considered.	Western, BLM and the Federal cooperating agencies cannot make a decision until the EIS process is complete.
Touch on Env. Justice in such an area	Environmental Justice is an issue because there are small populations.	The EIS will address potential environmental justice impacts to low income and minority populations, not small populations.
Pres. Council asks to supp. sustainability Renewables & How Western should be add. this, taking account. Why not more participants in renew.	Based on Presidential mandates, what is Western doing to support sustainable energy and renewables?	Western does have a renewable energy program. However, this program is not related to the purpose and need for the Big Sandy Energy Project. Western will share what it is doing to support sustainable energy and renewables with interested parties.

**TABLE 6-1
COMMENTS RECEIVED AT SCOPING MEETING**

Verbatim Flipchart Notes from Scoping Meeting	Actual Question/Comment Heard at Scoping Meeting	Response Provided at Scoping Meeting and/or Answers to Questions
How could MC use fresh water for power plant - Why is this a good idea?	How and why does Mohave County want to use good, fresh groundwater and let others use the effluent? Does the tax revenue provide more benefit than loss of a precious resource? Why not use other types of water resources?	Mohave County has approved with conditions the use of water for power plant use when the Board of Supervisors approved the rezoning for the power plant. The EIS will not attempt to assign monetary values to different resources.
Who is on the env. study? How are they selected? Who funds? Not lowest Want an impartial decision maker bidder? Include tribe in dec.	Who is going to be on the environmental studies team and how are they going to be selected? Important not to select the lowest bidder. The tribe needs to be included in the environmental studies.	Western and BLM have selected URS to conduct the environmental studies based on its technical qualifications. URS will be working with the Hualapai tribe in conducting environmental studies. The Hualapai Tribe is a cooperating agency.
How far away can the location be changed before the process starts over? What is process? Is it shortened?	How far away can Caithness move the plant before the (County rezoning) process is voided?	The rezoning applies to 120-acre parcel. If the plant moves outside of the 120-acre parcel, Caithness would have to apply for rezoning.
No rubber stamp for EIS team	Realistic, important decision needed on environmental contract. There should not be a rubber stamp of the environmental studies team. The environmental studies team has to make impartial decisions.	Caithness, BLM and Western have executed a memorandum of understanding that affirms that BLM and Western will independently direct the EIS contractor.
If plant goes in & there is an effect on the water-at what point would you stop?	If the power plant is constructed and it has an effect on the area's water supply, at what point would Caithness stop generating electricity?	A pump test protocol has been developed and reviewed by several hydrologists. The protocol includes pumping water from a production well and observing effects in nearby observation wells. The test will be implemented in late August or early September. The results will be used, together with a basin-wide water budget, to help assess long term impacts. The results will dictate whether monitoring and mitigation is needed to protect the area's water supply.
Addressing where the water is coming from-source Aquifer recharge?	Will Western and BLM address where the water is coming from? The aquifer recharge? Will isotope testing be conducted?	BLM and Western will address where water is coming from and aquifer recharge and will conduct isotope testing.

TABLE 6-1 COMMENTS RECEIVED AT SCOPING MEETING		
Verbatim Flipchart Notes from Scoping Meeting	Actual Question/Comment Heard at Scoping Meeting	Response Provided at Scoping Meeting and/or Answers to Questions
In comp. - other ppts & solar/wind generation using less water Dry cooling	The studies need to compare the environmental impacts of the proposed power plant to other generation types (e.g. solar and wind). Will the studies address a dry cooling option, as being used in a Boulder City, Nevada power plant?	BLM and Western are still developing the alternatives that will be addressed in the EIS, including alternative generation technologies and cooling options. Alternatives selected for detailed review in the EIS must substantially meet the purpose and need for the Project and be technically and economically feasible.
Detailed hydrolog. study	A detailed hydrological study is needed.	See response to similar comments above.
Sugg. that the closer you are to the project more you are against it. Plant.? Bullhead City or Lake Havasu	Why can't the plant be located closer to Bullhead City or Lake Havasu City where water is available.	The EIS will address the availability of water from the Colorado River. BLM and Western are still developing the alternatives that will be addressed in the EIS.
If power leaving Wikieup why is it benefit ?	If the power is leaving Wikieup, why is the Project a benefit to the Wikieup area.	The EIS will address both the potential benefits and negative impacts to the Wikieup area.

6.2.1 Public Workshops

Two public workshops were held to describe the Project and EIS environmental planning process to community members, as well as solicit public comments on the Project.

The first workshop was held on August 29, 2000 in Wikieup. BLM and Western described completed or ongoing environmental studies conducted since the May 3, 2000 scoping meeting, and provided meeting participants an opportunity to ask questions and discuss the Project with BLM and Western's EIS preparation team. Thirty people attended, representing both the community of Wikieup and other interested parties. A summary of questions and comments raised at the August 29, 2000 public information workshop followed by responses from BLM and Western staff is available on Western's website and the public reading rooms listed in Section 6.4 below.

The Hualapai Cultural Resource Program hosted a public information workshop on the proposed Big Sandy Energy Project on August 30, 2000 in Peach Springs. Nine people from the Hualapai community attended. The participants were briefed on Project activities and the status of ongoing cultural resource studies. Concerns which were expressed generally focused on potential impacts on the Hualapai land parcels located within the Big Sandy Valley and whether the Project would have potential benefits for the Hualapai Tribe. A summary of the workshop is available on Western's website and in the public reading rooms listed in Section 6.4 below.

6.2.2 Newsletters

BLM and Western have mailed nearly 600 copies of four different Project newsletters. The newsletters have been prepared and distributed to property owners in the vicinity of the proposed power plant site and proposed and alternative gas pipeline corridors; Federal, state,

and local agencies with interest or jurisdiction in the Project area; and interested parties. All newsletters contained general information such as Project background, description, and contacts.

The first newsletter was distributed in April 2000. This newsletter provided a list of decisions or approvals to be made, brief description of the EIS process and issues identified as potential areas for study, description of the public participation process, Project contact names and addresses, and anticipated Project schedule. The newsletter announced the time and location of the May 3, 2000 public information and scoping meeting and provided a response sheet and mailing instructions for persons interested in commenting on the Project.

The second newsletter was distributed in August 2000. This newsletter contained a summary of the scoping results, list of cooperating agencies, summary of EIS preparation activities completed to date, and an updated Project schedule.

The third newsletter was distributed in November 2000. This newsletter contained a summary of activities completed since the distribution of the August 2000 newsletter which included the following:

- two public information workshops held in August 2000
- groundwater testing
- consultation with the USUSFWS concerning the endangered southwest willow flycatcher

The fourth newsletter was distributed in April 2001. This newsletter described changes to the proposed Project, and presented a map of the new proposed and alternative gas pipeline corridors, a revised Project timeline, and schedule for the EIS process.

6.3 ADDITIONAL AGENCY CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

As described below, additional BLM and Western consultation and coordination has

included the review of planned impact assessments with cooperating agencies, review of investigations and studies regarding groundwater with the Hualapai Tribe, USFWS and ADWR, and consultation with USFWS regarding endangered species.

Following scoping but before environmental impacts assessments were commenced, all cooperating agencies were invited to review and comment on the following aspects of each resource topic addressed in Chapter 3 during meetings held on November 29 and 30, 2000 at the BLM Kingman Field Office in Kingman, Arizona and follow-up teleconferences on December 4, 7, and 8, 2000:

- identification of issues to be assessed
- significance criteria
- region of influence (area potentially impacted by construction and operation of the Proposed Action and alternatives)
- elements and tasks (to describe the existing environment and environmental consequences)
- assessment of data adequacy to perform the elements and tasks

Throughout the EIS process, BLM and Western have worked with ADWR, USFWS, and URS groundwater scientists and hydrologists as well as the Hualapai Tribe to plan and review the extensive investigations and studies described in Section 3.4, Groundwater. BLM and Western invited cooperating agencies to participate in numerous teleconferences regarding groundwater issues and meetings were held in Phoenix, Arizona on July 13, 2000 and August 31, 2000, and November 17, 2000 in Denver, Colorado.

Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act requires that BLM and Western consult with USFWS regarding threatened or endangered species which might be impacted. BLM and Western conducted informal consultation regarding the endangered southwestern willow

flycatcher during meetings with the USFWS in Phoenix on August 31, 2000 and March 22, 2001. Formal consultation with USFWS will occur as the EIS process progresses (refer to Section 3.14 for information concerning threatened and endangered species.)

6.4 FUTURE PUBLIC AND AGENCY INVOLVEMENT

Formal public scoping for the EIS closed on June 2, 2000. However, coordination and involvement with the public and appropriate Federal, tribal, state, and local government agencies will continue, and BLM and Western encourage comments on the proposed Project throughout the NEPA process (refer to Section 1.2, Readers Guide to This Document and the NEPA Process, for more information).

As part of the ongoing public participation process, BLM and Western will provide for public review of, and Western will conduct hearings on, this Draft EIS. The public and government agencies may submit comments on this Draft EIS during the comment period. Written comments should be addressed to the following:

Mr. John Holt, Environmental Manager
Western Area Power Administration
Desert Southwest Region
P.O. Box 6457
Phoenix, Arizona 85005

In addition, a public workshop will be held at Bible Church in Wikieup on July 10, 2001 prior to the public hearing to provide interested members of the public an opportunity to ask questions about the EIS analyses. A public hearing is planned, where oral comments will be

recorded and then addressed in the Final EIS. The public hearing will be held on July 24, 2001 in Wikieup. Notices of the public workshop and hearing will be published in the *Kingman Daily Miner* at least 15 days in advance; the announcements will identify the location and time of the workshops and hearings.

The Final EIS will respond to all oral and written comments received during the public review of the Draft EIS. After BLM and Western issue the Final EIS, public review during a 30-day waiting period will be encouraged, as well as public review of the independent BLM and Western Records of Decision (RODs).

Copies of the Draft and Final EISs, as well as supporting information such as references cited in the EISs that are not commonly available to the public, will be available for review in a public reading room at the BLM Kingman Field Office, 2474 Beverly Avenue, Kingman, Arizona.

As required by DOE regulations (10 CFR 1021.331, Western will prepare a Mitigation Action Plan (MAP) which will address mitigation commitments expressed in the ROD. Copies of the MAP will be placed in the public reading room for inspection. Copies of the MAP will also be available upon written request to Western.

6.5 LIST OF AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND INDIVIDUALS TO WHOM COPIES OF THE DRAFT EIS ARE SENT

The agencies, organizations, and individuals listed in Table 6-2 received copies of the Draft EIS:

TABLE 6-2
AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND INDIVIDUALS TO WHOM COPIES OF THE
DRAFT EIS WERE SENT

Federal Agencies

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Office of Energy Projects
Office of Deputy A/S of the USAF
Environment, Safety, and Occupational Health
Office of Civil Engineer
Directorate of Environmental Quality
U.S. Department of the Army
Corps of Engineers
U.S. Department of Energy
Western Area Power Administration
Reading Room
Office of NEPA Oversight
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
U.S. Department of Interior
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Bureau of Land Management
Bureau of Mines
Bureau of Reclamation
Fish and Wildlife Service
Minerals, Management Service
National Park Service
National Resource Library
Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance
Office of Public Affairs
U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration
Western Resource Center
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Federal Activities
U.S. Geological Survey
Environmental Affairs Program
U.S. Postal Service
Wikieup Station

State Agencies

Arizona Corporation Commission
Power Plant and Transmission Line Siting Committee
Arizona Department of Commerce
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality
Arizona Department of Transportation
Arizona Department of Water Resources
Arizona Game and Fish Department
Arizona State Land Department
Arizona State Clearinghouse
Department of Commerce

TABLE 6-2 AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND INDIVIDUALS TO WHOM COPIES OF THE DRAFT EIS WERE SENT	
Local Agencies	
Mohave County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning and Zoning Department Board of Supervisors Public Land Use Committee
Organizations	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Ahamakav Cultural Society Caithness Big Sandy L.L.C. Environmental Management Associates, Inc. Greystone Hopi Tribe Navajo Nation Historic Preservation Owens School Rural Utility Services Sierra Club, Southwest Office URS Corporation Yavapai Tribe

TABLE 6-2
AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND INDIVIDUALS TO WHOM COPIES OF THE
DRAFT EIS WERE SENT

Individuals

Abbott, Dave & Ann	Grim, Gary	Raymond, Jean*
Adams, Teresa	Haffner, John W.	Reyes, Alicia L.
Ambrose, Jerry	Halleman, Richard*	Robles, Ruben and Margarita
Anderson, Carol	Hayden, Phil Jr.	Russell, Fred
Anderson, Reed	Helstrom, Norma A.*	Russmann, Dale C.
Andrews, Ronald	Hernanek, Bernice	Sandler, Everett L.
Axen, Rita	Hernandez, Jesus	Saunders, Mike
Baebler, George T.	Hollingsworth, Thomas*	Sayles, Roger & Elizabeth*
Ball, John B.	Hudson, Charles F	Schott, Terry L.
Barlow, Oliver	Jamie, Martin	Seel, Robert
Benninghoff, Bernard	Janis, Lynn B.	Shurley, Bob
Benninghoff, John W.	Johnson, John & Roslyn*	Siefker, Bryan & Marnia
Berschawer, Bert	Jones, Roy	Skinner, Jim
Berry, Madgie	Judd, Elise Huff	Smith, Bob
Black, Joyce	Judd, Steve*	Smith, Rob
Bluett, Thomas T.	Kenebrew, David	Sorenson, Thomas J.
Bosma, Julia	Kostelny, Joseph (Mrs.)	Steel, Robert*
Boucier, Tim	Krueger, Orville	Straight, Roy & Ruth
Bowers, David	Lazich, Michael C.	Sullens, June
Brattstrom, Bayard H. Dr.	LeBlanc, Melvin	Sullens, Lee
Brown, Dan	Lewis, Patti	Sumner, Thell & Clara
Broz, Robert	Lindstrom, Wilbur	Tarvin, Shelly
Bryan, David	Lustig, John	Tenney, Joe
Burge, Krystal	Lynn, Howard	Travis, John & Marci
Carter, Bill	MacMillan, Geraldine A.	Trinkhaus, Walter J.
Carter, William	Majenty, Rory	Trust, Lee*
Colbert, Bill	Martin, Don*	Vanaman Jr., John W.
Cole, John K.	Mazzone, Christina	Van Brunt, Don
Conwell, James R.	Beniamino	Van Cleve, Hayden
Crawford, Robert	McCafferty, F. Mr. Mrs.	Van Hoven, Joan
Davis, Jonni	Meyer, J. Peter	Varga, Henry
Dommmrad, Stephen E.	Miles, Jennee	Verno, A.J.
Dunton, Roy*	Moore, Beverly J. & Merle W.	Wedlow, Fay L.
Duffey, Kathleen	Mowl, Richard	Weldon, James A. & Georgette
E.K. Holsinger	Neander, Herbert	Wheless, Lee R.*
Eller, Marvin	Nelssen, John B.	Whitworth, Marjorie A.
Erhardt, Jack	Nelssen, Marcia*	Williams, Gary
Essinger, J.H.	Neri, Anthony J.	Wilson, Ron
Filippelli, Ralph	Newell, John W.	Wilson, Ronald
Fisher, William D.	Nielson, Burt*	Wissinger, LeRoy*
Fisher, Daniel L	Noli-Decker Carol A.	Wolf, Kenneth G.
Flood, Tim	Owen, D.S.	York, Leona Mae
Foote, Ron*	Paez, Antonio C. & Lillian R.	Zodieru, Jehuda S. & Karen I.*
Francis, Walter	Parker, Michael T.	
Frank, William & Alice	Pattillo, Eddie	
Freitag, Theodore A.	Perkins, Mary Jane	
Gardner, Tim L.*	Petrosius, Joseph I.*	
Garritty, Brian L.	Proctor, Edwin E.	
Giardini, Mike	Pruitt, Larry M.	
Goodale, Bill	Purdy, Forrest & Jan*	
Gregorich, Andrew	Pynn, Howard	
Gregory, Florence F.*	Rafa-Niedoborski, Lois	

* Indicates requested Executive Summary of DEIS only